

PATENT

REMARKS

Specification is amended, including the Title and Abstract to correct the informalities and no new matter is added.

Claims 1-50 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 1, 14, 15, 28, 41, 42, 44, and 50 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-16, 20, 23-29, 33, 34, 37-45, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S. C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haskell et al. (6,005,622).

Under 35 USC 102(b), prima facie case of anticipation is established when the Examiner provides a single prior art or a reference that either expressly or inherently describes each and every element and that the elements are arranged as required by the claim.

Independent claim 1 and 28 recites among other elements, *"determining the difference between each quantized frequency domain element of the anchor frame and corresponding quantized frequency domain elements of each subsequent frame."* In order to establish prima facie case of anticipation for this element, the Examiner points to components (140, 330 and 340) of Haskell reference. Upon review of the disclosure of 340 component (Col 5, lines 13-15 and 25-27), it is clear that component 340 is describing subtracting a predicted AC coefficient of block A from the actual AC coefficient of the block X. However, the claimed element determines the difference of both AC and DC elements of anchor frame and both AC and DC elements of the subsequent frame. Thus, this description neither expressly or inherently described nor arranged as it is in claimed element of Independent claims 1 and 28.

Therefore, applicant believes the Independent claims 1 and 28 are in condition of allowance.

Independent claim 14, 41 and 44 recites among other elements, *"determining the difference between the quantized frequency domain element of a first frame and corresponding quantized frequency domain elements of a second frame; and repeating the process of determining the difference between quantized frequency domain elements of successive frames"*

PATENT

such that quantized frequency domain elements of each frame are compared against quantized frequency domain elements of the frame immediately preceding it." In order to establish prima facie case of anticipation for this element, the Examiner points to components (140, 330 and 340) of Haskell reference. Upon review of the disclosure of 340 component (Col 5, lines 13-15 and 25-27), it is clear that component 340 is describing subtracting a predicted AC coefficient of block A from the actual AC coefficient of the block X. However, the claimed element determines the difference of both AC and DC elements of anchor frame and both AC and DC elements of the subsequent frame. Thus, this description neither expressly or inherently described nor arranged as it is in claimed element of Independent claims 14, 41 and 44.

Therefore, applicant believes the Independent claims 14, 41 and 44 are in condition of allowance.

In view of the remarks above regarding independent claims 1, 14, 28, 41 and 44 applicant believes that dependent claims, which depend from the respective allowable independent claims, are also in condition of allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-16, 20, 23-29, 33, 34, 37-45, and 48-50.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 8, 17, 21, 30, 35, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haskell et al. in view of Lee (5,452,104).

Under 35 USC 103, prima facie case of obviousness is established when the Examiner provides one or more references that were available to the inventor and that teach a suggestion to combine or modify the reference, the combination or modification of which would appear to be sufficient to have made the claimed invention obvious to the one of ordinary skilled in the art.

In view of the remarks above regarding independent claims 1, 14, 28, 41 and 44 applicant believes that dependent claims including 3, 8, 17, 21, 30, 35, and 46, which depend from the respective allowable independent claims, are also in condition of allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 3, 8, 17, 21, 30, 35, and 46.

PATENT

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 15, 2005

By: 

Milan I. Patel
Reg. No. 41,242
(858) 651-651-6892

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502